

## Chapter Eleven

### JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

**T**HE situation of Jerusalem is majestic and impressive. It lies on four hills, which some with a taste for sacred numbers have wished to increase to seven; on three sides deep valleys encircle it. Both those that separate the hills and those that surround them were at an earlier period far deeper than they are now, since excavators have found accumulations of rubbish about them, varying in depth from forty to over a hundred feet; one of the hills was, it is said, deliberately lowered as a military precaution, and one of the internal depressions artificially filled up. Before these operations of art and nature were accomplished, the features which excite our admiration now must have been greatly accentuated. And those have taught us most about the ancient topography of the city who have driven shafts and tunnels through these accumulations, and mapped out underground Jerusalem. Their work constituted a record in excavation, and some of their names are dear to the British nation on quite other than archæological grounds. If they have left many a controversy undetermined, it is be-

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

cause inscriptions, the surest indications of ancient sites, have rarely been discovered, and still more rarely on the places where they originally stood; because the place has been often taken by relentless enemies, determined if possible to leave no stone upon another; and because ancient descriptions of it are often either ideal descriptions, or made by persons who wrote at a distance from the scenes which they described, and were perhaps unskilled in accurate observation and the technicalities of architecture.

The nature of the soil has determined the area of the city, but except for its brief period of glory, to which allusion will presently be made, there was no reason why it should ever have to harbour a great population. Since the building of the second Temple it has been far more a religious than a political centre; and even as such it has never been able to occupy quite the first rank. With Islam it was only occasionally and under special circumstances able to rival Meccah; with the more powerful portion of Christianity it was superseded by Rome. Probably the more energetic and capable of the Israelites have regularly preferred to be its occasional visitors than to constitute part of its permanent population. The class whom such a place attracts consists of persons worn out with worldly things, and interested only in spiritual concerns, while the expectation of a golden stream from outside discourages in the natives the original effort and the growth of those sterling qualities which the

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

struggle for existence ordinarily produces. Constantly recruited from without, it produces little or nothing from within. Thus for an indigenous art or architecture in Jerusalem no one looks; the explorer searches only for relics of the styles imported at different periods sometimes by domestic rulers, more often by donors and benefactors. The Solomonic Temple was in Phœnician style, the Temple of Nehemiah probably Persian; for later buildings the models were furnished by Greece, Rome and Byzantium, after which came Norman and Gothic importations from Europe; to-day the patterns in fashion in every European state of consequence are represented. Should a new Jewish Temple be built on the Haram area, it would probably be from French or Italian designs.

The period during which the city could claim the title imperial was very short, extending no longer than the reigns of David and Solomon, the former of whom appears to have brought several of the surrounding peoples into subjection. This is the view which we take, if we approach the Old Testament record without too great scepticism. With the name of the first of these two sovereigns the city has been in historic times connected, although there is a great doubt as to the part of it which he occupied; the operations executed by him with the view of making the place a metropolis are too briefly stated to permit of much being elicited. The name appears to go back to a much earlier period than that of David, who is said to have found the city, or part of it, in

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

possession of a tribe called Jebus, after whom it was then called; members of the tribe occasionally meet us after David's seizure of their stronghold. Their fortress is usually supposed to have occupied one of the hills only, with which the founder of Israelitish Jerusalem incorporated others, enclosing the whole with a wall. Such dwellings as already existed would then be allotted to those who helped to storm the fortress, and permission given for others to build. The speed with which the residence of a victorious prince attracts inhabitants is extraordinary, and Jerusalem was doubtless a populous city before his reign ended. That no sanctuary was erected by him to the national Deity seems certain, and the fact required explanation at an early time; that in which the later Jews acquiesced was that he was disqualified for erecting a sanctuary by the blood which he had shed, but the earlier explanation may have been different.

The only monument in the city's neighbourhood which may be actually connected with David is the King's tomb outside the Sion Gate. The exact spot where David was buried is not mentioned in his biography, but his tomb is employed as a landmark by Nehemiah, and is mentioned repeatedly by Josephus, who declares that the King had much treasure deposited with him, which in the centuries just preceding the Christian Era was despoiled by Hyrcanus and Herod. In the Acts of the Apostles also the tomb of David is mentioned as a well-known object in Jerusalem. A Christian tradition identifies a

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

room in the buildings surrounding the tomb as the Upper Chamber where the Eucharist was instituted and where the miracle of Pentecost was wrought. The room is said by Epiphanius to have remained undestroyed when the city was burned by Titus, and to have afterwards been used as a church. A convent for the Franciscans was here erected in the fourteenth century by Sancia, Queen of Robert of Sicily, which was taken from them by the Moslems in 1560, it is said, owing to the vengeance of a Jew, who had desired to perform his devotions at the tombs of David and Solomon underneath the convent, and had been refused permission by the Franciscans, and who then persuaded the Grand Vizier at Constantinople to take the tombs of the two Kings, whom the Koran calls Prophets, out of the hands of unbelievers. A few favoured travellers have had access to the tombs themselves, which appear to have been discovered in the time of Benjamin of Tudela, when stones were taken from the wall of Mount Sion to repair the church. The story of their discovery is not free from fabulous elements, but some monuments of artistic excellence appear to exist on the spot. The question to whom they belong has not been definitely solved, and even in Nehemiah's time the traditional site may not necessarily have been the real one.

Solomon's character, like that of David, is a familiar one to readers of Oriental history. While the father was the enterprising and astute empire-builder, the son was the magnificent patron of the

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

arts, of literature, and of commerce. Under him the metropolis began to be adorned with edifices worthy of the sovereign's power and wealth, and foreign artificers were summoned to erect them, the Phœnicians at this time occupying the place which at a later period belonged to Greeks, and after them to nations yet further west. Of the building of the Temple, the sacred writers have preserved a most elaborate account; and though there is some controversy as to the part of the Haram area which it occupied, there appears to be general agreement as to the practical correctness of the traditional site. The breaches in the continuity of the tradition are not indeed considerable; perhaps the most considerable being that between the times of Jeremiah and Nehemiah, though Moslem writers make it appear that when the Mohammedan conqueror wished to be directed to the site of the Temple, wrong directions were given him at first, apparently through ignorance. The probability is that none of the vicissitudes through which Jerusalem passed left the country quite without inhabitants familiar with so notable a site. Besides the Temple, the King's own domestic arrangements required the erection of several palaces, and probably of numerous shrines for the housing of the deities worshipped by the different nationalities represented in his household.

Of these palaces and sanctuaries the Bible preserves some names and some architectural details; but of the general appearance of the city in Solomon's time it is not possible to gather any distinct

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

impression. The material used by him appears to have been perishable in the extreme, and it is unlikely that any work executed by him still remains. Owing, however, to the memories of Solomon's wisdom and magnificence, legend attributes to him all anonymous works on a great scale that are to be found either in the city or in its neighbourhood. The theory that Solomon had supernatural agencies under his control enabling him to carry out the vastest designs can be traced back to the time of Josephus, and through the influence of the Koran has become an article of faith with Moslems. The Biblical account of his methods shows that no supernatural agents were requisite. The whole wealth of a small country, and unlimited labour, such as lay at the disposal of the Sultan of the time, would easily account for the execution of any of the works attributed to him. No contemporary traveller tells us what Jerusalem looked like in his day, for the memoirs of the Queen of Saba, if she left any, have not come down. Probably it was largely a collection of wooden huts. These form an intermediate stage between the dwellings of the nomad and the town resident; and the cry, "To your tents, O Israel" had not ceased to be heard in Solomon's time. The palaces differed from the other houses in the quality, but not in the nature of the material of which they were mainly constructed.

The magnificent monarch often leaves on the mind of his subjects not so much pride in his grandeur as resentment at the extortions which have been the

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

source of his magnificence, and with all but Solomon's own tribe and one other the latter appears to have been the sentiment which dominated. The unpopularity which has attached to the tribe of Judah ever since it became known to the general world, seems to have belonged to it in its relations with the other tribes constituting Israel, and so soon as Solomon was dead, they hastened to throw off a yoke, which indeed the King's taste for building by forced labour had rendered exceptionally severe. Other sanctuaries became more popular with the northern kingdom, which was far more populous and powerful than the small remnant which remained loyal to the family of David. That loyalty, however, appears to have been a deep-rooted sentiment, and to have kept the southern kingdom tolerably free from the scramble for the sovereignty which disturbed and finally wrecked the northern. The record which we have of both is exceedingly imperfect, and in the matter of building we hear chiefly of repairs done to the wall of Jerusalem, of the occasional erection of towers, and of provisions made for a better water supply. The only inscription in Jerusalem which is from the period of the kings is that which records the construction of an aqueduct in the time of King Hezekiah. This aqueduct, which took the form of a tunnel, appears to have been commenced at both ends at once, a fact which implies the existence of greater engineering skill, and instruments of greater precision, than we should ordinarily suppose to have been possessed by the Jews.



## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

The condition of Jerusalem during the period of the divided kingdom, as the Book of Kings records it, was by no means one of quiet development; it was, on the contrary, one of perpetual disturbance, in which city and Temple were repeatedly sacked, varied at times by spells of peace and prosperity under some competent ruler. The maintenance of the Temple was, it would seem, during the whole time, the chief function of the King, and according to the influences to which different kings were subject many innovations were introduced, both in the structure of the sanctuary and in the form of ritual. The unfriendly attitude adopted by the Jewish religion towards all others appears at least in practice to date from the last century of the monarchy; previously Jerusalem contained sanctuaries dedicated to objects of worship other than the God of Israel, and the Temple itself at times harboured altars of more than one Deity. The record which has come down to us of Jewish history is written in the spirit of Deuteronomy, and is too deeply hostile to pagan cults to take any interest in the monuments erected for their celebration; while, therefore, we hear occasionally of the names of deities to whom shrines were dedicated in Jerusalem, it is chiefly when the historian rejoices over their destruction; neither has he any more sympathy with sanctuaries intended for the God of Israel, but outside the Temple area. We therefore conjecture rather than know for certain that Jerusalem, in its best days, presented an appearance not unlike what it exhibits to-day, where with

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

one pre-eminent mosque representing the dominant cult, there is associated a variety of other mosques, churches and synagogues, the latter belonging, to a large extent, to strangers, though in part to natives; the notion that the sanctity of the chief edifice is impugned by the presence of these other places of worship has now been outgrown, though even before the Deuteronomic reform it had no wide currency.

The mode whereby that reform was introduced has been made out, so far as the nature of the evidence admits of positive conclusions, by those who have written on the history of Israelitish religion, and we know that when Judæism was once started on the doctrine of one God, one Temple, it drew the inferences with ever-increasing rigour. Probably those are right who trace the origin of the process to the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib, when the northern Kingdom had been swept away by Assyria. If, as the history suggests, there were strong reasons why the sect, whose motto was the doctrine stated, could claim the miracle as one granted specially to their cause, their ability to monopolise Judaism and in time Jerusalem seems to be explained. That effect was not attained without violent reactions, in the course of which Jerusalem itself perished, for the miracle was not renewed, and the violent religious persecutions which followed the reign of Hezekiah must have greatly reduced such power of resistance as the Jewish people might have been able to bring against the tremendous power of Babylon. Belief, however, in the

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

sanctity of the spot where alone a temple might stand and sacrifice could be offered was harboured as a precious heirloom by the descendants of those who had been forcibly ejected from the sacred city. The conviction that it would eventually arise from its ruins, no more to be polluted by alien worships, gave it for a time an ideal existence, and enthusiasts devoted their energies to planning how it should be laid out.

The time which elapsed before such operations could be executed seems to have been very lengthy. It is not now thought probable that there was a Jerusalem between that of David and that of Nehemiah; if there was it must have been a place of small importance, for the inquisitive Herodotus, who composed his inquiry in the fifth century B.C., had heard of Palestine but appears not to have heard of Jerusalem. Josephus answers that he had also not heard of Rome, a reply which seems unsatisfactory. A return from exile in the form of a splendid pageant, such as some of the Prophets awaited, did not take place; but early in the fourth century, B.C., one Nehemiah, who had won promotion at the Persian court, then in possession of the East, obtained leave to rebuild city and temple on a modest scale. The restored Jerusalem appears to date from his efforts, but the combination of his authentic narrative with another of unknown date and authority has rendered the process of restoration hard to follow. The unfriendly attitude adopted towards their neighbours by the Israelites seems to have involved the re-

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

builders of Jerusalem in difficulties, but there is no doubt that through the work of Nehemiah it was raised to the rank of something like a provincial capital, and this rank it retained when before the close of the fourth century Persian domination gave way to Greek.

For the gap which separates the termination of the Old Testament from the Maccabæan period even Josephus appears to have had only historical romances to guide him, but in the restored city, prevented by the suzerain power from having an independent foreign policy, something like the theocracy contemplated in the Mosaic legislation could be put in practice. And of the divine worship which constituted the main concern of the city the representation projected by the Books of Chronicles into the age of David is likely to be a faithful account.

The one fragment of history that belongs to this period tells how one of the high priests fortified the Temple and secured the city against besieging. This does not imply independence, but a wise precaution, since one of the most painful features of warfare in all but the most modern times was that the people, whether belonging to the ruling castes or not, suffered all the horrors that accompanied the sacking of cities in quarrels that were not theirs. During this period Palestine was alternately in the power of Egyptian and Syrian princes, and was perpetually exposed to their hordes. The peculiarities of Israelitish worship began to attract some attention in the Hellenic world, and with these the foreign garrisons

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

located in the Citadel could not fail to obtain a tolerable acquaintance. While in some cases the impression created was not unfavourable, in others Judaism roused the vehement hatred which for some reason or other it has constantly been found capable of exciting. Finally, in the first quarter of the second century B.C., the Syrian monarch, Antiochus Epiphanes, set himself the task of destroying Judaism, and compelling its adherents to adopt Hellenic culture. Pagan worship was instituted in the Temple itself, and the animal which for unknown reasons is abhorred by Jews and Moslems was selected for sacrifice. Interference with the exercise of the law provoked resentment which no amount of oppression of a different sort could have awakened: the family of Mattathias, a descendant of Asmoneus, was found equal to organising resistance, and its members by their victories secured to their countrymen a fresh lease of independence, and renewed prosperity for Jerusalem. A tower commanding the Temple area which had been erected by the persecutors was destroyed by the defenders of Judaism, and the Temple purified from its defilement.

To the Maccabæan period—or a little later—there belongs a description of the city, professedly written by a Greek of the third century B.C., but in reality by a Jew of a much later time, anxious as many as of his race have often been to conceal his nationality and identity. Whether this writer had ever seen the city which he depicts is uncertain: in any case his account is quite ideal and belongs rather to the con-

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

ception of the heavenly Jerusalem, of which we have seen the origin. Situated in the midst of mountains, on a high hill, Jerusalem was crowned with a Temple girt with three walls over seventy cubits high. The court of the Temple, which was paved with marble, covered vast reservoirs of water—this part of the description is confirmed by Sir C. Warren's discoveries—fountains of which washed away the blood of the myriads of beasts there offered. The streets formed a series of terraces stretching from the brow of the hill down into the valley, and were furnished with raised pavements, the purpose of which was to prevent the clean being contaminated by contact with the unclean. It was admirably fortified with a number of towers arranged like the tiers in a theatre. The compass of the city was about forty stades. The comparison of the city to a theatre, of which the temple area was the stage, has been made by others, yet its appropriateness seems very doubtful.

Before the Maccabæan dynasty had lasted a century, the precious possession of independence was sacrificed to the personal ambitions of rival claimants for the chief place in the State; Jerusalem was taken by Pompey, and the Holy of Holies profaned by the entrance of a stranger. But ere long Herod, who in the troubles which ruined the Roman Republic, had played with consummate skill a difficult hand, being installed as monarch, and obtaining possession of Jerusalem at the price of a tremendous massacre, restored the city to greatness by no means inferior to that of its imperial days. His deeds were

recounted by a contemporary of his own, whose work survives in the excerpts made by the Jewish historian Josephus, whose books form a storehouse of information on the topography of Jerusalem, which, if in no wise to be compared with Makrizi's account of Cairo, is yet highly prized for its fulness of detail.

Money ruthlessly extorted by Herod was spent by him in beautifying and strengthening his capital, where he rebuilt the Temple on a scale of unsurpassed magnificence—unless, indeed, the concept of the heavenly Jerusalem may have affected the representations of Josephus. The king built three towers "excelling all in the world in size, beauty and strength," which he named after his brother, his friend and his wife. To the north of the city he built a palace surpassing all powers of description, surrounded with a wall thirty cubits high, containing banqueting-halls, guest-chambers, avenues, channels for water, and all else that can be imagined. The white marble blocks of which the towers were constructed were so truly joined that each appeared to be one mass of stone. How much in the descriptions of these buildings is due to the imagination is unknown: the buildings themselves have disappeared without a trace. Herod's magnificence no more won the affection of his subjects than did Solomon's before him; the people at his death thought the direct yoke of Rome preferable to an Oriental despotism, and before the destruction of the city they had painful experience of both.

The Jerusalem of the Gospels is, of course,

Herod's Jerusalem, with some alterations effected by Roman occupation. On the whole the magnificence ascribed by Josephus to the buildings of Herod is borne out by allusions in the early Christian records, and an inscription discovered by M. Clermont-Ganneau, composed in the Greek of this period, in which strangers are forbidden to proceed beyond a certain point in the Temple area on pain of death, strikingly confirms the statements of the Jewish historian. The employment of the Temple at this time as a place where those who wished to give instruction could do so is similar to that which is characteristic of the Moslem Mosque. But the elaborate ritual of which the Temple was the scene has rather been inherited by the Christian sanctuary, though of course the abolition of sacrifice, due to the destruction of the Temple, has deprived religious worship of what used to be its most important feature. The attention of the Jewish historian and the oral tradition of his countrymen is so much engrossed by the Temple, the palaces and the forts, that little is left for the other public and private buildings which at this time filled the city; we hear casually of a gymnasium, and obtain a casual reference to public baths. We hear of numerous synagogues shortly after the destruction of the Temple, and it is likely that there was no lack of these, in different parts of the city, in the period which preceded that disaster. Some provision must also have been made for the religious wants of the foreign army of occupation, and indeed for those of other foreign visitors, though the Romans seem ordi-



## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

narily to have respected Jewish prejudices on this subject so far as possible. And especially must provision have been made for the great numbers of devout persons who visited the metropolis regularly at feast times.

Of Herod's descendants, Herod Agrippa, the friend of Claudius, who for his services in connection with the Emperor's accession had received his grandfather's kingdom, continued the work of fortification, and commenced, where practicable, a new encircling wall, rendered necessary by the growth of the population, which, had it been completed, should, in the opinion of Josephus, have rendered the city impregnable.

The city was for a short time the focus of general attention during the rebellion quelled by Vespasian and Titus, and ending in the fall of Jerusalem in the year 70. It would be interesting to know the amount of the population at this time, but our authorities give figures which could only with great difficulty be accommodated in the space; 600,000, or about eight times the present population, and 2,500,000, or about thirty-five times the existing numbers. Moreover, the present population covers an area which seems certainly to include ground that was outside the city besieged by Titus. The same must be said of these numbers as of the wall seventy cubits high that surrounded the Temple, that they suit the heavenly Jerusalem rather than the earthly. Whatever the numbers may have been, they were unable to defend the city, which appears to have been

destroyed no less thoroughly than after its capture by the Babylonians. Herod's three towers are said to have been left, with as much of the western wall as would serve to protect the ruins. It would seem that the destruction of the public buildings did not prevent a certain number of persons returning to their homes, and a community established itself there after the fall, similar to that which may have occupied the same site before the time of Nehemiah.

About sixty years after the fall a man who believed himself to be the Messiah, and persuaded others of the same, Bar Cochba, heading a new nationalist movement on the part of the Jews, seized the ruined city, refortified it, and proceeded to rebuild the Temple. The revolt was not more successful than that described by Josephus; and, after its suppression, Jerusalem was turned into a Roman colony, called Aelia Capitolina, with a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus on the Temple area. To that god in Vespasian's time the tribute had been assigned that had previously been sent by the Jews to their own Temple, and the Jews were forbidden access and even approach to the city of their fathers. The name Aelia supplanted the time-honoured name, which for a while belonged exclusively to the heavenly city of devotional fancy, which the fall of Jerusalem under Titus had caused to be painted in more gorgeous colours than before. Even now Aelia is with Moslems the alternative appellation for "the Holy City," and figures on the imprints of books printed at Jerusalem.

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

Of the events which led to Jerusalem being endeared to half the world, few at the time realised the importance. The progress of Christianity, its separation from Judaism, its honeycombing the Roman Empire, and its final adoption by a Roman emperor, form a fascinating subject of study, which at no time is likely to make the process perfectly clear. Except for the brief period occupied by siege and fall, it is probable that the Christian community at Jerusalem maintained a sort of continuity, and the concept of the New Jerusalem covered the site of the Old with a sanctity of which it was never divested, even before the instinct for pilgrimage found its interpretation in the desire to visit the sacred sites.

One of the first results of the conversion of the Empire to Christianity was that steps were taken to cover with worthy monuments the places where scenes of transcendent importance had been enacted. A church was erected with great magnificence by Constantine, containing within its walls the Tomb of Christ, the place of the Crucifixion, and the spot where the True Cross had been found.

What reason is there for supposing that the sites were still known in the fourth century, and could be accurately located? The question has often been debated, though it is uncertain when scepticism was first expressed. The best discussion of it is to be found in the posthumous work of Sir Charles Wilson, called "Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre," published by the Palestine Exploration Fund in 1906. The eminent explorer's conclusion is ambiguous, and

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

does not therein differ from that of many others who have been over the ground. There is no evidence that the site had any interest for the Christian community till long after all chance of being able to identify to it had disappeared, owing to the violent convulsions which had attended the taking of Jerusalem by Titus, its recapture at a later time by Bar Cochba, and its transformation into a Roman colony by Hadrian. To those who were filled with belief in the living Christ, any interest in the Holy Sepulchre would savour of the absurdity condemned in the Gospel of seeking the living among the dead. Only when an emperor desired the site to be recovered persons would not be wanting ready to discover it. The question for us is what indications led those who identified the site to select one rather than another. How came they to mention only the most obvious difficulty, to place the Tomb inside the City, when the Gospel leads us to suppose that it was outside? If the site was in accordance with authentic tradition, the City must have been moved, i.e., its walls must in the time of Constantine have included a space which they did not include at a time when there is great reason for supposing the City to have been far more populous. Moreover is the proximity of the Sepulchre to the place of crucifixion either likely or suggested by the sacred narrative? The writers who narrate the discovery of these sacred sites usually introduce into the story the miraculous element; and this portion of it is scarcely less improbable than the explanation given by some nar-

rators that the site was learned from a Jew tortured to reveal it. For why should such knowledge be preserved by Jews? Tradition seems unanimously to assert that the site was hidden beneath a Temple of Venus, a goddess of evil reputation, whose shrine was thought to be an intentional profanation of the holy spot, and that those who searched there were rewarded by the discovery of a grave, and presently by other confirmation of their find. The large literature that exists on this subject illustrates the varying effect of arguments not only on different minds, but on the same mind at different times. The ordinary visitor may be contented with Sir C. Wilson's conclusion that while there is no decisive reason, historical, traditional or topographical, for placing Golgotha and the Tomb where they are now shown, yet no objection urged against the sites is of such a convincing nature that it need "disturb the minds of those who accept in all good faith the authenticity of places that are hallowed by the prayers of countless pilgrims."

Other writers have expressed themselves with much less caution on this subject. Some have regarded the credit of Christianity as in a way bound up with the site selected in the time of Constantine, and even Sir C. Wilson says he would attach more weight to the opinion of Constantine's contemporaries than to the conjectures of modern scholars, if it is a question of conjecture. On the other hand, those who have been fortunate enough in modern times to hit upon places which seem to them to cor-

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

respond to the requisite conditions are apt to express themselves very positively; so Colonel Conder, whose suggestion is marked on modern maps, regards it as a happy occurrence that the sacred site was trodden by the Crusaders without knowledge of its importance, and so spared the terrible scenes that were enacted at the taking of Jerusalem in the immediate neighbourhood of the site selected by Constantine. Scepticism has once or twice been expressed on the identity of the present location of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre with that of Constantine's building; but for this there appears to be a continuous tradition, interrupted once or twice for a very few years only, not for a period during which there would be any probability of the site being forgotten. Of the interruption of the tradition before the time of Constantine there is no question, but we have no accurate knowledge of the length of the break. In a city built on the plain, a site is easily rendered unrecognisable by such convulsions as befell Jerusalem and its neighbourhood in the three centuries which elapsed before Constantine built his church; but on such ground as is occupied by Jerusalem, landmarks are somewhat more permanent.

In the period which followed the conversion of Constantine Jerusalem was adorned with many religious edifices, and the whole land began to teem with monasteries and the abodes of anchorites. There is a record of a strange attempt made by the Emperor Julian to restore the Jewish Temple on the area which probably contained a disused sanctuary

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

of Capitoline Jupiter, but for some reason or other this scheme was not carried out. The practice of pilgrimage to the sacred sites grew in popularity, and owing to various inconveniences that arose was at times discouraged, though with little effect, by the Fathers of the Church. The Empress Eudocia is said to have rebuilt the walls of the city, and to have founded various religious and philanthropic institutions both in and around the place. More importance attaches to the buildings of the Emperor Justinian, who erected a hospital for sick pilgrims and finished the Church of the Virgin which the Patriarch Elias had begun. Twelve years were occupied in the erection of this edifice, of which contemporary writers speak in enthusiastic terms. The platform on the Temple area selected for the building not being large enough, it was artificially increased by arches on substructures. New methods were devised for bringing stones and columns of a size vast enough for the building contemplated. The hospital was to contain 200 beds, and substantial revenues were settled upon it.

The Church of St. Mary in some way escaped destruction, when in 614 the nearer East was invaded by Chosroes—that last dying exploit of the Sassanian Empire, whose days were numbered. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre was not equally fortunate, as it, with all its contents, was burnt to the ground. The malice of the Persian invaders is said to have been directed by Jews, who, as usual, were destined to reap no permanent advantage from the catas-

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

trophe. If the figures of the historians are to be trusted, the massacre effected by the Persians must have been on as great a scale as any of the events of the kind witnessed by Jerusalem; 90,000 Christians of both sexes are said to have perished, and 65,000 corpses were presently gathered and deposited in a single cave outside the Western Gate.

The news of this terrible blow to the Byzantine Empire penetrated into Arabia, where the Prophet Mohammed, still at Meccah, foretold that the Persian victory would shortly be followed by a defeat. The rebuilding of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre appears to have commenced almost as soon as the Persians had departed, the name of Modestus, superior of the monastery of Theodosius, being connected with this restoration, which took ten years to accomplish. Mohammed's prophecy was fulfilled fourteen years after its occasion, and in 628 the conqueror Heraclius visited the city on pilgrimage, and the part taken by the Jews in the former disaster was now visited on them heavily at the time when their brethren in Arabia were suffering persecution at the hands of another enemy. The imperial visit had doubtless the effect of causing the city to rise fast from its ruins, and a few years later a calculation, which may rest on tradition or conjecture, estimates the population of Jerusalem at 12,000 Greeks and 50,000 natives, about the number of human beings which the city with its suburbs contains at the present day.

But the restoration of Christian rule in Jerusalem



## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

was not destined to be permanent. A power of which there had been no previous indication was springing up at the time, destined to give Jerusalem a new lease of existence as a sacred city, while banishing Christianity, at least as a dominant religion, from the nearer East. On Mohammed's mind the sanctity of Jerusalem had in his youth been impressed by those Jewish or Christian story-tellers with whom he had associated in his travels as a leader or as a follower of a caravan. And to him it had been portrayed as somewhat similar to the Bethel of Jacob's dream; the place where there was a ladder between heaven and earth, whereby visitors could ascend or descend. For him who was to be permitted to approach the Deity's abode Jerusalem was the starting point. Thither the Koran tells us the Prophet made a night journey from Meccah; and as dreamland is bound by no conditions of space or time, it was the Temple—long ruined and even polluted, but still the Furthest Sanctuary, furthest from us and so nearest to Allah—whither he was taken; it was there that—according to the tradition—he mounted the Pegasus that was to convey him to the upper world and its seven storeys. Whether the tradition that gives us the details of this eventful journey is all of it or any of it Mohammed's statement, cannot now be known; all that concerns history is that it was believed. Jerusalem was to the followers of Mohammed what Sinai was to ancient Israel, more than the unknown Mount of the Transfiguration ever became to Christians; and yet, just

as most Islamic institutions are coloured by something out of both the preceding systems, so the Furthest Mosque has associations similar to those that belong to each of these mountains. Starting thence the Prophet associated with some of his less mighty forerunners, and received the honours due to his worth; and thither he brought down some of the legislation which through the ages is distinctive of Islam. So long as Mohammed was bent on holding no compromise with Meccan idolatry, it was to the Furthest Sanctuary that his followers were commanded to turn when they prayed. Only when circumstances rendered it necessary to conciliate Pagans and exasperate Jews, was Meccah substituted as the direction of prayer.

Fourteen years after Mohammed's flight from Meccah came the Moslem conquest of Syria, decided by the battle of Yarmuk. The Patriarch of Jerusalem was invited to deliver up the city without resistance to the Caliph's general, Abu Ubaidah, and since the terms of capitulation included security for life and property, religious toleration, and involved only the payment of a poll-tax and certain other by no means vexatious duties, not much difficulty was made about accepting them. As the Christians, it is said, declined to treat with anyone but the Caliph himself, perhaps doubting the power of any subordinate to make treaties, Omar, the second follower of the Prophet, then reigning at Medinah, decided to accept this condition, and came to receive the capitulation of the sacred city. His name has ever

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

since clung to it, in connection with the Mosque of Omar, often falsely located.

From 636 till July 15, 1099, the city remained under Moslem government; the nature of which renders religious toleration very variable, since it depends on the taste of the ruler for the time being whether non-Moslems shall be molested or not. And in such a city as Jerusalem, the possession of which could not fail to be an object of keen desire to Jews and Christians, the tendency to fanaticism must always have been greater than in any part of the Moslem world, except perhaps the sanctuaries of Meccah and Medinah.

The Moslem conquest tended, therefore, to secure to Jerusalem sanctity similar to that which it had enjoyed under Byzantine rule, though to the Moslems it was one of three sanctuaries, to only one of which, and that not Jerusalem, pilgrimage was enjoined. When in Umayyad times the Caliphate gravitated towards Damascus, Jerusalem ran a chance of becoming the central sanctuary, perhaps even the capital of Islam; but this prospect was found to be incapable of realisation, and Islam would scarcely have survived such a shifting of its religious centre. If any place in Palestine could supplant Meccah, it should rather have been Hebron, the city of Ibrahim or Abraham, the mythical founder of the Islamic or Hanefite faith. The doctrine of the Koran connected the sacrifice of Abraham's son not with Mount Moriah but with the neighbourhood of Meccah, where, indeed, the Ka'bah was supposed to

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

have been rebuilt by Abraham and Ishmael; the heroes of Jerusalem were persons in the main respected indeed, but not of primary importance for Islam.

In accordance with the territorial division which the Arabs took over from the Byzantines, Jerusalem was situated in the Jund (or army) of Filastin (Palestine), of which the capital was Ramlah, in the time of the Caliph Sulaiman (715-717) who founded it, and long after; when Ramlah had been destroyed by Saladin in 1187, Jerusalem inherited the right to the title of capital in this province. But the history of Syria was chequered, and as the conquest of the Abbasids had meant the loss of the metropolis to that country, it had a tendency to fall to those usurpers whose efforts gradually led to the establishment of a western Caliphate, to which Syria regularly belonged. Professor Palmer observes that the ravages of the Carmathians in Arabia, where, in 929, Meccah itself was pillaged, and the Black Stone removed, led to Jerusalem being for a time the chief resort of Moslem pilgrims, a circumstance which also tended to cause a recrudescence of persecution.

The annals of a cathedral town, especially when it is not the capital of a province, are unlikely to be exciting; and the scantiness of the annals of Jerusalem before the Frankish conquest and after it is easily explicable. Its history is little more than a record of damage and repair to the Christian and the Moslem sanctuaries. This, as will be seen, is fairly well recorded, but the governors of the place were not

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

sufficiently important for chronicles of their doings to be kept. The present condition of the city, in which the Christian feasts are the matter of real importance, which the Moslems, whose religious concern they are not, have to regulate, is likely to reflect the state of affairs that has been normal since the Moslem conquest. The Moslem is a casual visitor, the Christian a visitor to be reckoned on. He is not a welcome guest, but as a show place lives by its visitors, it is unwise to discourage him too much. On the other hand, a place of pilgrimage loses something of its attractiveness, if it be too accessible; exploits over which no risk is incurred are of little honour. So long then as the Christian pilgrims were only moderately humiliated and fleeced, Jerusalem could prosper.

Mr. Lestrangle, whose "Palestine under the Moslems" contains extracts from Moslem writers both before and after the Crusaders, lucidly arranged and interpreted with reference to the present topography of Jerusalem, has drawn attention to the descriptions of Jerusalem by Moslems who wrote at the end of the tenth and in the middle of the eleventh century respectively. The first of these was a native of the place, whose description is somewhat coloured by patriotism, and by the theory of the heavenly Jerusalem. The second, a Persian visitor, of excellent repute as a writer, estimated the population at twenty thousand, and fancied that as many more Moslem pilgrims sometimes came in the month of pilgrimage.

Numbers of Christians also came on pilgrimage,

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

and the Jews had a synagogue which was to them what the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was to the Christians; the native writer of half a century before declared that these two communities had all the power. One can hear similar complaints from Moslems now in Turkish cities. Both praise the place for its cleanliness; which, however, they rightly attribute to the geographical position of the city, and to the mode in which the streets are laid out, which permits impurities to be carried down by the rain. Of the list of eight gates made in the tenth century only one, the Bab al-Amud (called by Europeans the Damascus Gate) has preserved its name up to the present time. The sites of the remainder are not difficult of identification. Perhaps some of these may be on the same sites as gates mentioned by Nehemiah, though the variations in the elevation of the soil renders this doubtful.

In spite of the assertions of these writers the condition of the Christians within Jerusalem, as in other places where Moslems were in power, was precarious in the highest degree. They were in a way hostages for the good behaviour of their coreligionists outside; and activity on the part of the Christian powers might be avenged on them. Moreover, Islam was lacerated by internal wars, and the contributions which the different aspirants to power required for the support of their armies could more easily and conveniently be levied on unbelievers than on believers. The Crusaders were preceded by armies of pilgrims, large enough to inspire suspicion, though

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

not of sufficient size to attempt violence with much hope of success. The destruction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in 1010 by the mad Hakim had aroused some indignation in Europe, and the Seljuke rule, which at Baghdad was accompanied at first by violent disorders, had put the Christians of Palestine in a worse plight than before. The Jews, whether truly or not, were supposed to get at the ear of Moslem sovereigns, and avenge the ill-treatment of their brethren in Europe by falsely accusing the Christians of the East. Yet all the wrongs of the branches of the Church subject to Moslems, and all the humiliations to which pilgrims from the West were subjected, would have produced no effect, had not one man been found gifted with the enthusiasm, the eloquence, and the energy to transform sentiment into words and action. The historians of the Crusades rightly give Peter the Hermit a place beside the most powerful movers of human masses that are known to fame. That such a man should have proved but an indifferent fighter is not surprising; credit must be given him for the possession of more organising ability than many mere rousers of enthusiasm have been able to display.

The movement started by Peter the Hermit led to the foundation of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, of which lucid accounts have been given by Conder, Palmer and many others. On Friday, July 15, 1049, after a siege of forty days, Jerusalem was taken by the forces led by Godfrey of Bouillon, who himself was the first to scale the wall. His scaling tower,

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

which had been vainly tried on the east of the city, was advanced with greater effect on the north side of the wall, near the gate called after Herod; and when once the city had been entered on this side, the forces of Raymond of Toulouse entered without difficulty from the west and south. The vanquished Moslems sought refuge partly in the Haram area, and partly in the Tower of David. In the former place a massacre took place, in which the slain are estimated by Arabic writers, accustomed to exaggerate, at 70,000; while the other refugees appear to have been sent in safety to Askalon by the efforts of Count Raymond. The impression created by the news in the Moslem world was vast. An attempt was made at Baghdad, its centre, to start a rival crusade for the delivery of the captured city, but the time was not yet ripe amid Moslem dissensions for such an enterprise.

Godfrey was appointed ruler of the reclaimed city, where he refused on religious grounds to bear the title king. He proceeded to transform the mosques into what many of them had been before, Christian churches, and to arrange on western lines for the proper maintenance of these as also of those churches which the Christians had under Moslem domination been allowed to retain. A patriarch was soon appointed without reference to either the local Church or to the Pope; and a code of laws gradually drawn up which has won much admiration, as displaying a spirit far in advance of the time to which it belongs. For military purposes a modification of the feudal



## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

system of Europe was introduced in the new kingdom, which was to include all Palestine, with certain vassaldoms beyond its confines.

Among the most remarkable phenomena of the Crusades was the establishment of the orders at once military and ecclesiastical of the Templars and the Knights of St. John. The Templars were lodged in Aksa Mosque, which at first was used as a royal palace; when in 1118 the Order was founded, King Baldwin removed to other quarters, and the knights were housed in what they called the Temple of Solomon, to which they made various additions for religious and other needs. The Muristan, now incorporated in the recently built German Church, retains the memory of the Hospice of the Knights of St. John, who there had two buildings of this nature, one for males and another for females. They were not the first buildings of the sort for the use of Christians even since Moslem domination; since the good relations between Charlemagne and the famous Harun al-Rashid had rendered it possible for the former to found a hospice in Jerusalem, and in general obtain tolerable conditions for the Christians resident there. A third Order, the Teutonic, also had a hospital of St. Mary in Jerusalem, founded after that of St. John's Knights, for the accommodation of German pilgrims.

The theory of the Frankish kings appears to have been to exclude Moslems from Jerusalem, just as non-Moslems were excluded from the Arabian sanctuaries. In order to replenish the devastated city the

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

second king, Baldwin I., brought into it a number of Syrians from villages beyond Jordan. The needs of trade appear to have caused the admission of a certain number of Jews into the city during Frankish times, since a traveller found two hundred Jewish dyers living under the Tower of David. The various branches of the Oriental Church, Abyssinians, Armenians, Copts, Georgians and the different sects of Syrians appear to have all found representation in the Frankish city, just as they find it now.

Whereas at one time it was supposed that the West owed much of its architecture to the East, the converse is now very generally believed. "The monuments," says Colonel Conder, "which the Latins left behind them attest their mastery in the art of building. The masonry was far more truly cut than that of the Byzantines. The slender clustered pillars, the bold sharp relief of the foliated capitals, the intricate designs of cornices witness their skill as masons and sculptors." The authors of "The Survey of Western Palestine" have made out a list of thirty-seven churches known to have existed in Jerusalem or in the vicinity of the city walls in the twelfth century. "Nor," they add, "is this all that remains of the crusading town, for wherever the explorer walks through the Holy City he encounters mediæval remains. The whole of the present Meat Bazaar, adjoining the Hospital of St. John on the east, is crusading work, representing the old street of Mal-cuisinat; and the walls of the street leading thence towards the Damascus Gate, together with a fine

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

vaulted building on the east side, are of mediæval masonry. The present Tower of David is the Crusading Castle of the Pisans, which was rebuilt as soon as the city was taken by Godfrey. The so-called Kal'at Jalut in the northwest angle of the present city is the mediæval Tancred's Tower."

The Frankish kingdom of Jerusalem lasted eighty-eight years, and the throne was occupied during that time by nine sovereigns, one of them an infant, and more than one under the influence of a woman. Apparently western government of eastern states can only be carried on successfully when the western invader is not a colonist, but a temporary occupant, to be replaced after a time by some one fresh from the West; the colonist speedily degenerates and cannot even cope with the indigenous inhabitant. Although the state founded by the Crusaders was perhaps less disturbed by wars and dangers than the ordinary histories of the time might lead the reader to believe; and the condition of Moslems subject to the Frankish king was not intolerable, the new kingdom took no root, and it is agreed by students that the effect produced by the Crusaders on Europe was far greater than anything which they achieved in Asia. It has been pointed out that many Arabic words remain in European languages, as mementoes of that enterprise, whereas few, if any Frankish words have got into the vernaculars of Syria or Egypt in consequence of the presence of the knights. When once the differences between the sections of the Islamic world had been appeased by the great Saladin, the ejection of the

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

Franks ceased to be impossible. The final battle, of Tiberias or Hattin, fought July 2, 1187, ended with the army of the King of Jerusalem being annihilated by Saladin, and the King himself, Guy of Lusignan, falling into the Moslem leader's hands. The defeat appears to have been due to incompetent leadership on the Christian side, not to brilliant generalship on the part of Saladin. The effect, however, was the same. Town after town now fell back into Moslem hands, and after a futile attempt at resistance Jerusalem was given back by capitulation to Saladin on October 2 of the same year. Few events in the history of Islam are more honourable than Saladin's entry into Jerusalem without massacre and without pillage. According to the Mohammedan historian of Jerusalem the number of the inhabitants at the time was 100,000, from whom ransom was demanded at the rate of ten dinars per man, five per woman, and one per child. Guards were stationed at the gates, and only those who paid their ransom allowed to go out. Yet several managed to climb down the walls, and many were released on one pretext or another, the Sultan being kind-hearted.

The recovery of Jerusalem by the Moslem Sultan counted in the East as no less an exploit than its conquest had counted in the West, and pilgrimages to Jerusalem commenced from all Islamic countries. The Frankish residents sold their goods for whatever they would fetch, being anxious to quit a Moslem city; and it was suggested to the Sultan to seize the gold and silver in the churches, as not having

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

been included by the capitulation, but he, anxious for the fair fame of Islam in Europe, refused to profit by this suggestion. Owing to the crusade for the second recovery of Jerusalem in which the English king, Richard I., played so noteworthy a part, Saladin deemed it advisable to strengthen the fortifications of the city, and for that purpose came and took up his abode in the hospital near the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, now called Muristan. Artisans were sent for from Mosul, with whom 2000 Christian prisoners were compelled to work; a series of towers were constructed from the Jaffa to the Damascus Gate, a trench being at the same time excavated in the rock, whence the stones were used in erecting the towers. The Sultan himself set the example of carrying stones on his saddle, and the whole Moslem population, including ecclesiastical and military dignitaries, helped in the work. In this way operations that might have taken, we are told, many years, were accomplished very quickly. The English forces did not actually besiege Jerusalem on this occasion, as a treaty was made between Richard and Saladin, securing certain advantages for the Christians in the holy city. Whence its great number of Moslem inhabitants had come we are not told; but probably the state of war caused many to be homeless, and of the Moslem pilgrims attracted by the recovery of the place many may have been induced to remain by the favourable conditions on which property could be purchased; and the colleges of Baghdad must have been turning out numerous jur-

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

ists and theologians anxious to be placed. A certain number of Christians, we are told, asked and obtained leave to continue residing in the city on the terms granted by Moslem rulers to tolerated cults.

The work of Saladin was not to remain undisturbed. In 1219, when Damietta was being besieged by the Franks, Isa, called al-Muazzam, who had inherited Syria from his father al-Adil, fearing that Jerusalem might again be taken by the Christians, sent a party of masons and sappers to destroy it. This measure was followed by a general stampede of the inhabitants, who disposed of their property at ruinous prices. The people who remained assembled in solemn supplication at the two great sanctuaries on the Temple area, where this sovereign had himself carried out many works of decoration, besides founding schools for the study of law and grammar in the vicinity. Doubtless the idea of this prince was the humane and advanced one that the only way to avoid disputes between the two religions was to render the city common property, each sect having free access to its own sanctuary—a condition which would be rendered impossible by the presence of walls and fortresses, which must necessarily be in the possession of one party, only too likely to tyrannise over the other. The prince should have lived either much earlier or much later for his views to be practical.

Some authorities go so far as to assert that his workmen reduced the whole city to a heap of ruins with the exception of the great Christian and Moslem sanctuaries and the Tower of David. The de-

molition of these walls shortly afterwards caused the failure of negotiations for the restoration of Jerusalem to the Franks, as an indemnity was demanded which the Egyptian Sultan refused to pay. In 1229 owing to the quarrels between the representatives of the Ayyubid family, the Emperor Frederic II. succeeded in obtaining the ruined city from the Egyptian Sultan, on condition that the walls should not be rebuilt, and that there should be no interference with the sanctuaries on the Temple area. These terms naturally gave little satisfaction to either of the contending religions. For eleven years the Franks held the city under them, when al-Nasir, prince of Kerak, on the pretence that the conditions under which the sacred city was held were being violated by its fortification, attacked the place, and levelled to the ground the Tower of David which al-Muazzam had spared. But for four years afterwards (1243) on the arrival of the Duke of Cornwall, brother of Henry III., with a company of English Crusaders, the former treaty was renewed, the Prince of Kerak who was in possession finding it desirable to obtain the aid of the Franks for purposes of his own. It was not, however, to remain long in European hands. The next year the Egyptian Sultan obtained the help of the subjects of the Khwarizm-Shah, driven from their country by the Mongol hordes, and 20,000 of these appeared before Jerusalem, whose defences had only begun to rise after their complete demolition. The Khwarizmians, whom history represents as little less savage than the Mongols, swept away the Christian

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

population, beheaded the priests ministering at the altar in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and wrought great havoc in that edifice; the graves of the kings there buried were opened, and their ashes scattered, and other churches in and about the city were desecrated or demolished. Since the year 1244, Jerusalem has remained in Moslem hands.

With other possessions of the Ayyubids, Jerusalem was handed on to the Mameluke dynasties, whence it came into possession of the Turks. The attitude adopted by these dynasties towards Jews and Christians was ordinarily tolerant, and both Jews and Melchite Christians undoubtedly received better treatment under their rule than under that of the Franks. At no time since the abandonment of the Crusades has the City of David been the focus of public attention in both East and West, as it was when Europe and Asia were contending for its possession. It sinks into provincial mediocrity, and is entirely overshadowed by Cairo or Constantinople, the capital whence it derives its ruler. Even its special historians have little to say about it from this time. To the imperial historians it is chiefly of interest as a place of exile or retirement of eminent men who commemorate their residence there by some benefaction.

The ruined fortifications appear to have lain in heaps till the time of the Ottoman Sultan Sulaiman, the builder of the existing walls which bear date 1542. To the Christians the chief interest of the place lay in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre; to the Mos-



## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

lems in the Temple area. For these two sanctuaries, Jerusalem might be said to exist.

In order to be true to the title of this book, a little should be said about the work done by the Mameluke Sultans for the decoration of the city. Baibars I., who built a mosque over the supposed Tomb of Moses, is said to have instituted the festival in honour of the "Prophet Moses," which to this day serves as a sort of counterpoise to the Greek Easter. He renewed "the stonework which is above the marble" of the Dome of the Rock. Outside the city on the northwest he built in the year 1264 a khan or hospice, which he adorned with a door taken from the Fatimide palace in Cairo, and on which he settled the revenues of several villages in the neighbourhood of Damascus. The building contained a mill and a bakehouse, as well as a mosque. Its purpose was to harbour visitors (perhaps belated visitors) to the city, and an arrangement was made for the distribution of bread at the door. In Mujir al-din's time the revenues had already been sequestrated, and no more bread was handed out. Baibars also repaired the Dome of the Chain.

The Sultan Ketbogha is credited with having done some repairs to the stonework of the Dome of the Rock, and having rebuilt the wall of the Temple area which overlooks the cemetery of the Bab al-Rahmah in the year 1299. His successor Lajin renewed the mihrab of David in the southern wall near the Cradle of Jesus.

The great builder Mohammed al-Nasir naturally

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

left some memorials of his taste in Jerusalem. He faced the front of the Aksa Mosque with marble, and opened in it two windows which are to the right and left of the mihrab. This was done in the year 1330-1331. He had the domes of the two chief edifices regilt, so well, says Mujir al-din, that, though in his time 180 years had passed since the operation, the work still looked brand-new. He rebuilt the Gate of the Cotton-merchants in very elaborate style.

The Sultan Sha'ban, grandson of Nasir, built the minaret near the Gate of the Tribes in the year 1367. He renewed the wooden doors of the Aksa Mosque, and the arches over the western stairs in the Court of the Dome, opposite to the Bab al-Nazir, nine years later. The next year the Franciscans on Mount Sion were massacred by this Sultan's order.

The great Sultan Barkuk built the Mueddin's bench opposite the mihrab in the Dome of the Rock, and repaired the Sultan's Pool outside Jerusalem on the west. The author quoted remarks that it had gone to ruin and was useless in his day. In 1394 a governor named Shihab al-din al-Yaghmuri, appointed by Barkuk, placed on the western door of the Dome a marble slab containing a declaration that various imposts instituted by former governors had been remitted.

The following Sultan Faraj placed on the wall of the Bab al-Silsilah a slab declaring that in future the Sultan's representative at Meccah and Medinah must be a different person from the governor of Jerusalem, which was to form an administrative unit with

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

Hebron. The effect of this edict was quite temporary.

The Sultan Jakmak on the occasion of his turning the Christians out of the Tomb of David in the year 1452 instituted a severe inquisition into the monasteries of Palestine, and, in consequence of this, damage was done to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and other Christian edifices. New constructions raised by the Franciscans in the Monastery of Mount Sion were demolished, and a chapel erected by them near their cloister was in 1491 destroyed by order of Kaietbai.

We may now condense the history of the two chief sites. The Temple area, containing the Dome of the Rock and the Furthest Mosque, counts, as we have seen, as one of the three great sanctuaries of Islam. On the Israelitish temples that once stood there much has been written, and ingenious reconstructions of them are exhibited by the heirs of the late Dr. Shick; it does not come within our scope to do more than allude to them. When Jerusalem was taken by the Moslems, the church erected by Justinian was on part of the area; and a late writer who narrates the erection of the Moslem temple, states that Omar prayed in this building. For the rest the account reproduced by E. H. Palmer of the founding of the Furthest Mosque has been shown by Mr. Lestrangle to be apocryphal. It belongs to a period after the recovery of Jerusalem from the Franks, when the Arabs produced many an historical romance, and the exploits of the early heroes of Islam were adorned

with divers fabulous details. According to these works Omar, coming to the Sacred City to receive the capitulation of the Patriarch, demands to be shown the Furthest Sanctuary. He is taken to the Church of the Resurrection, but tells his guide that he lies; he is then conducted to another church, and again refuses to be cajoled; finally, he is brought to the Temple area, which, from Christian spite against the Jews, is covered so thickly with refuse that it can scarcely be approached. The Caliph proceeds in great humility to clear away the refuse with his cloak, and his followers aid him. Even when this work of purification has been performed the area has to be three times cleansed by rain from heaven before prayer on it is permitted. Apparently this story is in the main an etymological myth, to account for the name Kumamah (sweepings) applied by Moslems not to the Temple area, but to the Church of the Resurrection (Kiyamah). The connection of Omar's name with the Dome of the Rock is probably due to the tradition of his clearing the site. A curious description of a building by him above the Rock has been preserved by Adamnan, Abbot of St. Columba, as related to him by a French pilgrim, Bishop Arculphus. He states that the Mosque of the Saracens was a square building, put together of planks and beams yet large enough to contain 3000 worshippers.

The building by Omar of a Mosque in Jerusalem is, however, not recorded by early Arabic historians, though Mr. Lestrangle has discovered an allusion to

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

it in the Byzantine chronicler, Theophanes. Of that which now bears his name the Arabic geographers appear to take no notice; it is a meagre building, probably meant to commemorate a site on which the Caliph said his prayers, he having magnanimously, according to the legend, refused to do this in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, for fear this might afterwards give the Moslems a title to the place; a story which implies that Omar possessed a remarkable power of projecting himself into the future. That the Moslems who took Jerusalem did not seize the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is doubtless due to the fact that this site could have no interest for them, since their system denies both the death and resurrection of the Christian Saviour; the very name Holy Sepulchre involves according to them mendacity almost comparable to that of the Cretans. The Temple area contains two sacred buildings of primary importance, the Dome of the Rock which is in the centre, and the Furthest Mosque. Both are ascribed to the Caliph Abd al-Malik, who reigned from 685-705, and who had a political reason for endeavouring to make Jerusalem once more supersede Meccah as the great place of pilgrimage. Belonging to the Umayyad dynasty, which, though descended from the most stubborn of the Prophet's opponents, had, through the ability of Mu'awiyah, the first Umayyad Caliph, not only usurped the Prophet's throne, but made it a hereditary possession, he had the same reasons as Jeroboam of old for wishing to divert the stream of pilgrimage from the place

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

where both objects and persons would remind the visitors that their sovereign was seated on a throne to which others had a better claim. The worship of a stone was held by the ancients to be the main article of Arabian religion, and to this sentiment Mohammed had to give way, though Omar was notoriously reluctant to retain the ceremony of kissing the Black Stone, which was the nucleus of the Meccan Ka'bah, the surrounding sanctuary, and of Islam. Abd al-Malik, like most of the Umayyads, considering religion as of political value only, fancied he could satisfy his co-religionists if he provided them with a stone and a sanctuary round it, and appears deliberately to have started the cult of the Rock round which he in the year 691 built the Dome which was to correspond with the Ka'bah, ordaining at the same time a ceremony similar to the time-honoured circuit round the Meccan shrine. Like Jeroboam he went so far as to forbid the pilgrimage prescribed in the Koran, and substituted his own for it. The second founder of the Abbasid line of Caliphs, whose capital Baghdad became world-famous, made a similar endeavour, and for the same reason; the fear that a visit to Meccah might turn Moslems into partisans of the Prophet's descendants. But even in the year 691 the ordinances of Islam were too deeply rooted to permit of so tremendous an innovation; and later writers, regarding even the attempt as inconsistent with ordinary prudence, suppose the sagacious Caliph's purpose to have been to counteract the effect produced on men's minds by the magnificence of

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

Christian churches existing at the time at Jerusalem and elsewhere.

It should be observed that some eminent authorities identify the Dome of the Rock with Justinian's Church of S. Sophia, and it has even been suggested that the Rock is itself one of the sites regarded as Golgotha. This opinion has, however, few supporters.

With regard to the Stone it appears that nothing is known of it prior to the statement of the Bordeaux Pilgrim, who visited Jerusalem A. D., 333, and asserts that near the two equestrian statues of the Emperor Hadrian still standing on the Temple Area there was a pierced stone which it was the custom of the Jews to anoint with oil once in the year, when they wailed and tore their garments, after which ceremonies they retired. The process of pouring oil on stones belongs to the pre-Mosaic religion of the patriarchs; it has no countenance in the law of Moses. We find, however, that according to the Moslem tradition the anointing of the stone was ordered by the Umayyad Abd al-Malik, and continued till his dynasty closed. It would seem, then, that what the Dome of the Rock restored was not a Mosaic cult, but one which belongs to a different stratum of the Israelitish religion, which somehow was continued, probably in secret during the domination of Judaism, and after the destruction of the Temple was revived. The ordinary theory identifies the rock with the site of the altar of burned sacrifice, whence the blood is supposed to have been conveyed into a chamber below

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

the rock, whence it was drained into the Kedron. Other suggestions have been made by eminent explorers.

The name of Abd al-Malik lies concealed in the inscription above the cornice of the octagonal colonnade which supports the Dome. For Abd al-Malik the name of Mamun, who reigned from 813 to 833, has been substituted, the alteration being still noticeable in the crowding of the letters, and the different tint of the tiles. The person who made this alteration forbore to alter the date also, whence Mamun is said to build this Dome in the year 691 (72 A. H.), nearly a century before his birth. From M. van Berchem's *Corpus of Cairene inscriptions* we have already examples of this mode of alteration, which reminds us of the treatment by ancient compilers of the documents which they embodied in their books, resulting in contradictory statements being left side by side. M. van Berchem thinks that the bronze plates above the northern and eastern doors belong to the period of Abd al-Malik, but in these cases both names and dates have been altered, the latter to the year 216 A. H. (813 A. D.)

The quotations of Mr. Lestrange show that the shape and appearance of the Dome have varied very slightly since its foundation by Abd al-Malik, though during the period that has elapsed it has frequently suffered from earthquake, and the episode of the occupation of Jerusalem by the Franks might have been expected to leave a permanent mark upon it. The chief effect of the Frankish possession would



seem to be found in the chipping away of pieces of the rock to be taken to Europe as relics; the priests in charge of the Rock being amply paid for these fragments. This abuse is said to have led to its being paved over as a precaution; Saladin ordered the pavement to be removed, the Moslem theory of sacred objects being different from the Christian. The accounts given by different visitors vary somewhat as to the number of columns, but in most matters are in striking agreement with the present condition of the edifice. Abd al-Malik undoubtedly employed Byzantine artists for his building, and to them is due the extremely rich mosaics which cover the arcades above the columns, form a wide border round the dome and fill the spaces between the windows. The cubes are not only of glass coloured and gilt, but of ebony and mother-of-pearl, which latter material gives a lovely translucent effect in the dim light beneath the dome. The designs are chiefly large vases and crowns whence wreaths and garlands depend.

Other sovereigns who have left inscriptions in the Dome, commemorating work done by them in restoring or beautifying it, are the Fatimide Caliph Zahir (1022 A. D.), who rebuilt it after it had fallen in, in consequence of the earthquake of the year 1016; Saladin (1187), who renewed the gilding; the great Cairene builder, Nasir, son of Kala'un (1318 and 1319), and the Ottoman Sultan Mahmud II.; the last repaired the Dome in the first third of the nineteenth century, but the inscription which records what he

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

did is imperfect. Of the restoration by Sulaiman, the Magnificent (1520-1566), there is no commemorative inscription.

Yet much of the special beauty of the mosque is due to him; it was he who restored the cupola and altered its windows, the arches of which are slightly pointed, while the older and wider arches beneath are round; he filled them with coloured glass in an elaborate setting of small patterns so that the light filters through with rich effect. He substituted Persian tiles on the upper parts of the outer façade for El-Walid's mosaics: for this he probably imported Persian potters, as his predecessors had mosaic workers. On the broad border round the building a broken colour effect is obtained by the juxtaposition of glazed bricks of very varied shades, chiefly blues, from turquoise to full and dark tints relieved with pale and rich greens, while the bricks of the archivolts are glazed on their outer surfaces with blue and white alternately. The pilasters between the windows are chiefly of a golden brown. These, however, seem to have suffered more from restoration than other parts. And there must be frequent occasion for restoration. We saw workmen without ladders attempting to remove weeds growing far above them, with a long pole pointed with metal, this while ineffective against plants, as it could at most cut off their leaves, scratched the enamel, and occasionally knocked out a tile. Several bays have lost their marble casing and are temporarily covered with a plastering like mud till Yildiz Kiosk allows the re-

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

placing of the slabs, which are, we were assured, ready to hand.

The other great building which occupies part of the Temple area, the Aksa or Furthest Mosque, was probably built at the same time as the Dome of the Rock or rather transformed into a mosque from the remains of Justinian's Church; but there appears to be no authentic account of its origin. The later romancers state that in Abd el-Malik's time the gates were covered with plates of gold and silver, which were stripped off and turned into money by order of the Abbasid Mansur, who utilised the sum so obtained for restoring the Mosque after the ravages of an earthquake, which had wrecked it shortly before the fall of the Umayyad dynasty. Another earthquake brought the building down after this restoration, and the Caliph Mahdi (775-785 A.D.) had it rebuilt, but with the proportions somewhat altered; for supposing that the weakness of the edifice had been occasioned by excessive length and deficient breadth, he made the new building shorter but broader than the old. It has been shown that these Caliphs did actually visit Jerusalem, whence there is no inherent improbability in the romancers' statements with regard to the successive restorations, though the story of the gold and silver plates is probably apocryphal. According to a geographer of the tenth century, in the restoration effected by Mahdi, the rebuilding of the several colonnades was assigned by the Caliph to various governors, but a portion of the ancient edifice and that supported on

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

marble columns, remained embedded in the new. A marble colonnade on the north side had been added in the first half of the ninth century by the governor of Khorasan.

The account of the building given by the historian of Jerusalem at the end of the fifteenth century agrees very closely with its present condition, but those historians who described it before the times of the Crusaders appear to have seen a much more magnificent edifice, double the width of the present Mosque, with 280 pillars supporting the roof, and fifteen aisles. The Mosque has now seven aisles only. The dimensions, according to the eleventh century traveller, were 420 by 150 cubits, the former a wholly impossible figure, for which Mr. Lestrange reads 120, making the width greater than the length. Another English writer supposes the Mosque to have suffered in the taking of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, and accounts for its reduced dimensions (230 feet by 170) by the work of the Franks, who, however, are supposed to have added rather than to have taken away, and whose work was removed without much difficulty, it would seem, by Saladin. In the case of a building at Jerusalem the chance of exaggeration cannot be eliminated, whence it seems doubtful whether there is any necessity for the hypothesis to which reference has been made.

The small Dome of the Chain, which is a few paces east of the Dome of the Rock, is supported on seventeen pillars, without any enclosing wall, except on the kiblah side. Moslem writers have fabulous

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

accounts of the reason why a chain was suspended from this dome, which in Frankish days is said to have been called the Chapel of St. James the Less. Mr. Lestrangé has, in this case, too, the merit of having refuted certain fictions that have got into European works from a late Arabic historian of Jerusalem, with reference to the origin of this building, which may be as old as the Dome of the Rock. A dome should serve to shelter something, probably an image, and the fact of this dome being open all round is evidence that its original purpose must have been something of the kind.

Another of the many isolated buildings is a little *sebil*, or drinking fountain, built in 1445 by Kaietbai, of whose Palace in Cairo we have an illustration, and who has left traces at Damascus also of his love of building. This fountain is thoroughly Egyptian in style, and bears considerable resemblance to Kaietbai's Tomb, especially in the shape of the cupola, its ornamentation of arabesques and its metal finial.

Of the other domes and sanctuaries included in the Temple area the existence is certified at various times before the Crusades, but there would appear to have been some variation both in their names and location. The same is true of the eleven gates of the area.

We have seen that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre goes back to the time of Constantine, who enclosed the three sites of importance within a single building. After the destruction of the church by Khosroes three, or according to some authorities

## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

four, separate churches were erected in the same area. In 1010 the church was again destroyed by order of the Fatimide Caliph Hakim; various accounts are given of the motive or occasion for this arbitrary proceeding, and, as might be expected, the Jews are supposed to have had hand in it. In the case of this particular despot it is unnecessary to search for either. Rebuilding is said to have commenced shortly afterwards, but it would appear that serious operations did not begin till 1037, after lengthy negotiations between the Byzantine Emperors and the Egyptian Caliphs; the church, in the condition in which it was found by the Crusaders, was finished by the year 1048, chiefly at the expense of Constantine Monomachus, who sent Byzantine architects for the purpose. The cave of the sepulchre was surmounted by a circular church, while detached chapels were erected over the other sites, which were now, owing to the accumulation of legends, more numerous than they had been in the time of Constantine or Heraclius. The Franks enlarged the Rotunda, which covered the sepulchre, by the addition of the choir, from the southeast of which walls were built so as to include the Calvary chapel, while on the east the choir was connected through the Chapel of St. Helena with the Chapel of the Invention of the Cross. During the Frankish period the Church was, of course, in the possession of the Latins, whereas after the conquest of the city by Saladin the Greeks resumed possession; certain rights were afterwards purchased for the Latins in

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

1305, and in 1342 they obtained possession of the Chapel of the Apparition. Of the damage done to the Church by the Khwarizmians when the city was finally restored to the Moslems mention has already been made, and at some time all entrances were closed except one in order to save Moslems trouble in the collection of admission fees from pilgrims. In 1502 Peter Martyr was sent by Ferdinand of Arragon to negotiate a treaty for the defence of pilgrims and the maintenance of the sanctuaries. In 1598 the Pasha of Damascus wished to turn the church into a mosque, but was induced to desist by the representations of French and Venetian envoys. These dates are given by Sepp, who has also gone more fully than other writers into the history of the Latin orders established in Palestine, and the martyrdoms endured by overenthusiastic preachers to Moslems, till orders were issued from Rome, forbidding such endeavours. In 1808 a conflagration occurred which did considerable damage, but this had been repaired by September 11, 1810, at a cost of 4,000,000 of roubles. To one who has witnessed the ceremony of the appearance of the Sacred Fire it is marvellous that such conflagrations are not more frequent.

Modern Jerusalem is the product of a variety of forces which had free play in the nineteenth century, religious revivals in England and America, archæological enthusiasm in the same countries, and political ambitions on the part of various European nations concerned with the nearer East. To these there has been added in quite recent times the force

## CAIRO, JERUSALEM, AND DAMASCUS

of Zionism, the programme of those who regard a return to Palestine as the natural solution of the problem raised by anti-Semitism in the countries where there are the largest Jewish congregations. The relations between the Ottoman empire and the European powers being so very different from what they were when Europe was in disorder, Jerusalem has by these various forces been transformed into a centre for religious and philanthropic effort, unconnected to a great extent with either of the sanctuaries which formerly constituted its chief attraction. Curiosity attracts nearly as many visitors as are drawn by devotion, and the ease with which pilgrimage can be accomplished detracts somewhat from its merit. While the Christian and Jewish quarters are constantly expanding, the latter indeed at an enormous rate, the Moslem population shows no sign of increase, and its members, while not unaffected by European philanthropy, appear ordinarily incapable of emulating Western enterprise. Those who, like the Khalidi family, do so, are happily adopting the conception of unsectarian philanthropy, which the new and bloodless invasion from Europe has brought. The enthusiasm which characterised the descriptions of those who arrived there at the cost of vast sacrifices is wanting in the memoirs of the traveller who is conveyed thither comfortably by steam; yet it is probable that in population and in the beauty of its buildings modern Jerusalem would compare favourably with the Jerusalem of any earlier period. Certainly at no time have life



## JERUSALEM: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH

and property been so safe, or the relations between the different elements of the population so satisfactory. The number of tongues spoken by its inhabitants and its visitors, great even in the time of the Apostles, is now phenomenal, being variously estimated at from twenty-five to forty. But the dangers which used at one time to attend a great influx of strangers are now almost forgotten, and the most crowded solemnities pass off with little or no disorder. Should the present tendencies meet with no unexpected check, the city may long maintain the position of an international sanctuary, common to the chief religions of the world.